

## **REMARKS**

In an Office Action dated February 26, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,125,137, hereinafter referred to as “Wang”) in view of Subramanian (U.S. patent no. 6,934,319). The Examiner allowed claims 15 and 16. The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Subramanian. The pending application is a divisional of U.S. application serial no. 09/545,125, filed April 7, 2000, and priority thereto was claimed in a Preliminary Amendment that accompanied the filing of this application. The priority date of the pending application, that is, April 7, 2000, predates the issue date of Wang, that is, September 26, 2000, and therefore it is apparent that Wang is being cited as §102(e) art in a rejection under §103(a). However, Wang and the pending application are assigned to a common assignee, that is, Motorola. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully contend that, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c)(1), Wang is not proper prior art in a rejection under §103(a).

Subramanian merely teaches a despreader. Nowhere does Subramanian teach the apparatus of claim 11 that includes a first signal processing block and a second signal processing block, wherein the first signal processing block is for processing a first received signal according to a first communication standard to produce a first received processed signal and the second signal processing block is for processing a second received signal according to a second communication standard to produce a second received processed signal, and which apparatus further includes a combiner for combining the first and second received processed signal to produce a combined signal. As Subramanian does not teach the apparatus of claim 11 and Wang is not proper prior art, the applicants respectfully request that claim 11 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 12-14 depend upon allowable claim 11, the applicants respectfully request that claims 12-14 may also be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive objections and rejections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Furthermore, please charge any additional fees (including any extension of time fees), if any are due, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,  
Louay Jalloul et al.

By:     /Steven May    

Steven A. May  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,912  
Phone No.: 847/576-3635  
Fax No.: 847/576-3750